



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,235	02/06/2001	Uppili Srinivasan	260/207	5762

23639 7590 04/14/2004
BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

MIZRAHI, DIANE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

52

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,235

Applicant(s)

SRINIVASAN ET AL.

Examiner

DIANE D. MIZRAHI

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5_8-9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

III. DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15, 21 and 23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Specification pages 1-7, and Applicant hereinafter) in view of Robert D. Ainsbury et al. (U.S. Patent# 6,078,924 and Ainsbury).

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant teaches a database table (page 4, lines 17-20) data identifying attribute values of objects belonging to a plurality of (page 4, lines 17-20) comprising information that relate said attribute values (page 4, lines 17-

20; see also page 2, lines 12-19) to said objects represented within said database table (page 4, lines 17-20).

Applicant does not teach object classes and one or more catalog tables.

Ainsbury teaches object classes (i.e. set of classification to catalog) (col 25, lines 1-57) and one or more catalog tables (col 42, lines 20-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Applicant with the teachings of Ainsbury to include the claimed, "object classes and one or more catalog tables" with the motivation to provide the user the understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision-making (col 2, lines 40-49).

Regarding Claim 2, Applicant teaches directory information objects (page 1, lines 14-15).

Regarding Claim 3, Applicant teaches directory information objects comprise LDAP information (page 1, line 21).

Regarding Claim 4, Applicant teaches directory information objects comprise X.500 information (page 2, line 1).

Regarding Claim 5, Applicant said database table comprises a column identifying attribute names (page 2, lines 12-19).

Art Unit: 2175

Regarding Claim 6, Applicant teaches database table comprises a column identifying said attribute values (page 2, lines 12-19).

Regarding Claim 7, Applicant teaches said database table comprises a column identifying object identification numbers (page 3, line 11).

Regarding Claim 8, Applicant does not teach a separate catalog table for each attribute type.

Ainsbury teaches teach a separate catalog table for each attribute type (i.e. management type such as types of information).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Applicant with the teachings of Ainsbury to include the claimed, "a separate catalog table for each attribute type" with the motivation to provide the user the understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision-making (col 2, lines 40-49).

Regarding Claim 9, Applicant does not teach said one or more catalog tables each comprises a row identifying object identification numbers that correlate to said attribute values.

Ainsbury teaches one or more catalog tables each comprises a row identifying object identification numbers that correlate to said attribute values (i.e. case element or catalog element) (col 27, lines 45-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Applicant with the teachings of Ainsbury to include the claimed, "one or more catalog tables each comprises a row identifying object identification numbers that correlate to said attribute values" with the motivation to provide the user the understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision-making) (col 2, lines 40-49).

Regarding Claim 10, Applicant teaches said attribute values are stored in said database table in a protocol ready format (i.e. LDAP protocol format) (page 1, line 21).

Regarding Claim 11, Applicant teaches said protocol ready format is the LDAP protocol format (page 1, line 21).

Regarding Claim 12, Applicant teaches a database table (page 4, lines 17-20) comprising data identifying attributes of objects belonging to a plurality of (page 4, lines 17-20; see also page 2, lines 12-19); and a distinguished names table comprising information that identify unique system identification names for said objects represented in said

Art Unit: 2175

database table (i.e. inter-relates title, section, and story objects by their globally unique identifiers and creates a routing table which is used to located objects across multiple database partitions) (col 2, lines 17-39).

Applicant does not teach object classes.

Ainsbury teaches object classes (i.e. set of classification to catalog) (col 25, lines 1-57) and one or more catalog tables (col 42, lines 20-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Applicant with the teachings of Ainsbury to include the claimed, "object classes and one or more catalog tables" with the motivation to provide the user the understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision-making) (col 2, lines 40-49).

Regarding Claims 13 and 15, Applicant does not teach distinguished names table identifies full paths of parent objects for said objects.

Ainsbury teaches said distinguished names table identifies full paths of parent objects for said objects (i.e. objects by their globally unique identifiers and creates a routing table which is used to located objects across multiple database partitions) (col 2, lines 37-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Applicant with the teachings of Ainsbury to include the claimed, "distinguished names table identifies full paths of parent objects for said objects" with the motivation to provide the user the understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision-making) (col 2, lines 40-49).

Regarding Claims 14, Applicant does not teach full paths of parent objects are stored with higher hierarchical levels of the paths listed before lower hierarchical levels of the paths of said parent objects.

Ainsbury teaches full paths of parent objects are stored with higher hierarchical levels of the paths listed before lower hierarchical levels of the paths of said parent objects (i.e. Internet Cascades to a list of the Favorites for Internet Explorer Explorer) (col 29, lines 15-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Applicant with the teachings of Ainsbury to include the claimed, "full paths of parent objects are stored with higher hierarchical levels of the paths listed before lower hierarchical levels of the paths of said parent objects" with the motivation to provide the user the understanding necessary

to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision-making) (col 2, lines 40-49).

Regarding Claims 21 and 23, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

Joint Inventors

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane D. Mizrahi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3806. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-9000 for regular communications and (703) 305-9000 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9001.



Diane Mizrahi
Primary Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

April 10, 2004